

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the Office Action of June 12, 2006 is respectfully requested.

Enclosed herewith is a set of Replacement Drawing Sheets (Sheets 1/9, 2/9 and 3/9 with the drawing revisions discussed below).

Applicants filed on July 23, 2004 an Information Disclosure Statement. It does not appear that an initialed PTO-1449 form has been received back. Thus, in the next Office Action, Applicants respectfully request return of an initialed version of the earlier filed PTO 1449.

In this Amendment some minor specification revisions have been made to correct some noted errors. No new matter is considered to have been introduced with these specification amendments.

Also, the Drawings have been amended as follows:

Figure 1:

- a) reference number 24 has been added into the figure
- b) the reference number "48" has been changed to -- 49 -- .
- c) the reference number 46 and the corresponding box (like that shown in Figure 2) has been added to Figure 1.

Figure 2:

- a) the reference number "48" has been changed to -- 49 -- .

Figure 3

- a) "Map Image Data Input" to -- Map Image Data Input --
- b) "Means" added in the description of schematic box 44.
- c) Reference line for "48" now appears as arrowed reference line 48.
- d) "Means" added in the description of schematic box 40.

No new matter is submitted as being introduced with these drawing revisions and the aforementioned specification amendments include revisions conforming with the drawing corrections made.

The present amendment cancels original claims 1-6 in favor of new claims 7 to 27 with claim 7 being the sole independent claim which is directed at common subject matter as original claim 1. No new matter is considered to be presented by these new claims in view of the support contained in the original filed application (e.g., see original claim 3 and the disclosure bridging pages 5 and 6 relative to automated no need/need criteria or necessity/non-necessity criteria). Also, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are in full conformance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The Examiner indicated that "switch over means" in claim 1 is not supported in the Specification. This assertion is respectfully traversed insofar as the current wording of the claims include the terminology "switchover means". In this regard, reference is made to page 5 of the present application describing both manual switchover means and automatic switchover means and the further discussion on page 6 relative to the other forms of automated switchover means such as a time of use or non-use based switchover means as well as the vehicle condition switchover described on page 21 of the present application. The switchover means thus implements a switchover of a display image in the display means (e.g., a layering or full screen changeover, etc., as noted in page 8, lines 13 and 14) based on a variety of inputs including automated alone or in combination with a manual switchover means (e.g., touchscreen contact)

Reference is also made to the disclosure on page 9 concerning processor system 36, as well as the disclosure in the second half of page 11 describing Figure 3A as including “means for switching the navigation image (e.g., a function of the processor system or an independent means preferably associated with a display screen interface (not shown), and “...data storage means from which the processor can derive the favorite image data at the time of activation or switchover by the user.”

Reference is also made to lines 3 to 7 on page 12 describing switchover means 48 shown in Figure 3A (with the drawing correction including a change in the reference arrow for 48 to reflect its tie in with, for example, processor 36 as described (above and below) which is illustrative of a preferred embodiment. Lines 5 to 15 further describe some of the potential embodiments for the switchover means and potential usage of processor 36; as well as the further discussion of processor 36 shown as Figure 3B which as described on page 16 can include a variety of operating systems which are helpful in coordinating activity such as the activity feeding input to what data the display means is to display.

As the test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make the or use the invention from the disclosure in the application coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would be readily enabled of the claimed invention following a review of the originally disclosed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully withdrawal of the enablement rejection.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all rejections raised in the Office Action are overcome such that the application is in condition for allowance. Applicant looks forward to confirmation of the same at the Examiner's earliest

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/800,667
Attorney Docket No. 032405R134

convenience. Also, if any fees are due in connection with the filing of this amendment, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to Deposit Account 02-4300; Order No. **032405R134**.

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Dennis C. Rodgers, Reg. No.: 32,936
1850 M Street, N.W. – Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone : (202) 263-4300
Facsimile : (202) 263-4329

Date : September 12, 2006